

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 remain in this application, with claims 1, 7, 12 and 20 being independent claims. Each of the independent claims has been amended.

It appears that the Examiner has rejected Claims 1-3, 6-8, 11-14, 20-23, and 25 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klem (US 5646978) in view of Ekman (US 6807422). Claims 4, 9, and 15-16 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klem in view of Ekman and further in view of Srinivas (WO 01/82551), and Claims 5, 10, and 17-19 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klem in view of Ekman and further in view of Gibbs (US 6683877).

Regarding independent claims 1, 7, 12 and 20, Applicants assert that these claims as now presented are not disclosed, taught or rendered obvious by any of the cited references, whether the cited references are taken alone, or in any reasonable combination. In particular, none of the cited references disclose or render obvious the present invention in “a single call server in a wireless softswitch” (see for example independent claim 1). Support for this matter can be found, at least, in paragraph [0016] of the application. As the present invention is neither taught, disclosed nor rendered obvious by the cited references, Applicants respectfully assert that independent claims 1, 7, 12 and 20 are in condition for allowance.

Regarding claims 2-6, as these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1, and therefore incorporate all the limitations therein, for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are also allowable over the cited references.

Regarding claims 8-11, as these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 7, and therefore incorporate all the limitations therein, for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 7, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are also allowable over the cited references.

Regarding claims 13-19, as these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 12, and therefore incorporate all the limitations therein, for the reasons set

forth above with respect to claim 12, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are also allowable over the cited references.

Regarding claims 21-25, as these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 20, and therefore incorporate all the limitations therein, for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 20, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are also allowable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully requested that the rejection of the claims be withdrawn and full allowance granted. Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, please contact Craig Hoersten at (972) 519-5143.

Respectfully submitted,
ALCATEL

Dated: August 17, 2006

/Craig A. Hoersten/
Craig A. Horesten
Reg. No. 38,917

Alcatel USA
Intellectual Property Department
3400 W. Plano Parkway, M/S LEGL2
Plano, TX 75075
Phone: (972) 519-5143
Fax: (972) 477-9328